



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/602,409	06/23/2000	Akihiro Urano	773-008	9099

7590 10/28/2002
SOFER & HAROUN, L.L.P.
Suite 1921
342 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10173

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CAM LINH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/602,409

Applicant(s)

URANO ET AL.

Examiner

Cam-Linh T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1- 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi et al (U.S. 5,873,088).

♦ As per claim 1, 5, 7, 10, 15,

- "A plurality of database systems" See Fig. 1 elements 17A and 17B, column 6 line 13 – 15.

Hayashi does not disclose an "integrated database" but discloses a derived database which have same function as an integrated database that includes:

- "A directory database which stores, as to each of the data stored in said plurality of database systems, a correspondence with directory information" Fig. 1 element 15, See column 6 line 29 – 32.
- "A directory control unit" Fig. 1 element 11, column 6 line 25 – 28.
- "A database identifying unit" Fig. 1 element 13, column 6 line 44 – 50.
- "A database control unit" Fig. 1 element 12, column 6 line 40 – 42.
- "A database system includes a database server unit which access a database" Fig. 1 element 19, column 4 line 44 – 47, column 6 line 50 – 55.

Because the derived database of the reference have the same function as “an integrated database” as claimed, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill with the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the “integrated database” with the “derived database” of Hayashi in order to have an integrated database system that easy to access a particular object stored in a particular database server.

♦ As per claim 2, 6, 8, 11,

- “A local data name of each of the data” is referred same as a name in the table or original name (see column 7 line 1 – 5). Further, “a global name” is referred same as a new name which is assigned for used in the derived database.
- Hayashi teaches that: when the derived database 18 is used, a dictionary information manipulating unit 13 refers to a dictionary 15, selects necessary logical and storage structure components among database definitions by a derived database interpreting unit 14, and replaces an alias, if designated, with its original name (See column 6 line 44 – 55).

♦ As per claim 3, 9, 12,

Referring to Fig. 1 elements 17A and 17B, database 17A comprise table TA1, Ta2, and TA3, which are “local data name” and “unique identifiers” in the database system. By using the “derived database interpreting unit” to replace the alias with original name, and a “database processing procedure” to generate a processing procedure for a partial collection of components of a plurality of databases, it would have been obvious that the claimed provision is inherent.

♦ As per claim 4,

Claims 4 is rejected same as claim 1. The reference only submitted two independent databases but it can add more databases to derived database through the register unit, or it can be at least one database to register in the database register unit.

♦ As per claim 13 - 14

- "Database unit has a readable storage medium" See Fig. 1 element 16, column 6 line 9 – 10.
- Claim 14 is rejected same as claim 1.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- De La Hueraga et al (U.S. 5,895,461) teaches a method and system for automated data storage and retrieval with uniform addressing schema.
- Ferrel et al (U.S. 5,907,837) teaches an information retrieval system in an on-line network including separate content and layout of published titles.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam-Linh T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305- 1951. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (703) 308- 1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703- 746- 7239.

Art Unit: 2171

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703- 305-3900.

Cam-Linh Nguyen

Art Unit 2171


SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100